DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 355 UD 021 311

AUTHOR Mizokawa, Donald T.; Morishima, James K.
TITLE Education for, by, and of Asian/Pacific Americans, I.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 80
CONTRACT NIE-G-76-0069
NOTE 35p.; For a related document see UD 021 313.
AVAILABLE FROM Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Room 2220, University Library, Amherst, MA 01003 ($4.00 plus postage).
JOURNAL CIT Research Review of Equal Education; v3 n3 Sum 1979

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; *Adjustment (to Environment); *Asian Americans; Communicative Competence (Languages); Cultural Differences; Cultural Images; *Educational Discrimination; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Bias; *Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Stereotypes; Ethnic Studies; Immigrants; Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; Self Concept; *Social Discrimination; Textbook Bias
IDENTIFIERS *Pacific Americans

ABSTRACT

This report discusses several perspectives on Asian/Pacific Americans and the educational issues that relate to them. It begins by providing a definition of "Asian/Pacific American," an historical account of their immigration, and a discussion of minority status and cultural relativism. A number of studies and personal experiences that demonstrate stereotypic attitudes and prejudice against Asian/Pacific Americans are cited. The report then analyzes the educational needs and experiences of the Asian American community. The issues of language, self concept, ethnic stereotypes, and curriculum bias are addressed. It is claimed that textbooks offer a negative and stereotypical view of Asians, and that ethnic studies programs, as presently structured, are unable to correct these distortions. The importance of person-environment match in the education and social adjustment of Asian/Pacific minorities is stressed. (APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199355

3

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Summer 1979

Volume 3, No. 3/Summer 1979

Meyer Weinberg, Editor
Kevin F. Grennan, Editorial Associate
Sarge Ruck, Development Director

Published quarterly by the
Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education
School of Education, University of Massachusetts
Room 2220, University Library
Amherst, MA 01003
Phone: 413/545-0327

US ISSN 912008-14-8

Subscription rates:

1 year $15.00
2 years $28.00
3 years $38.00
(Add $1.50 per year for foreign postage)
Single copy: $4.00 plus postage:
30¢ domestic 40¢ foreign

Publication of the **Research Review of Equal Education** is made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The views expressed herein are solely those of the authors and no endorsement or support from the National Institute of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is intended or should be inferred.

MAR 9 1981

RESEARCH REVIEW OF EQUAL EDUCATION

The Education For, By, and Of Asian/Pacific Americans, I

Donald T. Mizokawa
and James K. Morishima

College of Education
University of Washington

3 Introduction

4 Asian/Pacific American History, Culture, and "Minority-Ness"

6 History

8 Minority Status

10 Culture and Cultural Relativism

13 Minority Group Experiences and History

17 Social Issues in Asian/Pacific American Education

31 Works Cited

UDO 213 11

The Education For, By, and Of Asian/Pacific Americans, I

Donald T. Mizokawa and James K. Morishima

Introduction

Any view of Asian/Pacific American education must deal with several perspectives. First, a clear notion of who the Asian/Pacific Americans are must be established before a discussion of the education of these peoples can become meaningful. Misconceptions and misinformation abound. The beginning section of this survey therefore provides a definition of "Asian/Pacific American," a concise historical account of the immigration patterns of the progenitors of these Americans, and a discussion of culture as it applies to this group of very diverse peoples. The peoples we are talking about are Americans, not Asians, and this section should clarify this position.

Also, the education of any child must be analyzed and interpreted in light of the broader social context in which the child lives. The second section addresses the social issues impinging upon and influencing the educational life of the Asian/Pacific American child. Though reference is typically made to the specific factors affecting elementary and secondary school learners, the social context of Asian/Pacific Americans' education is the whole of America and, as such, applies to students enrolled in institutions at the postsecondary level as well.

Finally, the goals and the difficulties of implementing Asian/Pacific American education need identification and discussion. Many educators have argued that any change that takes place must not reside solely in schools, but in systems—school systems, social systems, attitude systems, value systems, government—before change can be wrought that benefits the student. The last section focuses on the overall goals of, and problems faced by, those seeking equitable and fair education for the Asian/Pacific American learner. While many of the goals of and obstacles to quality education face all school children, not just the Asian/Pacific American, special attention to the unique character of Asian/Pacific American education is emphasized.

There is no denying that Asian/Pacific American education presents a major challenge to a broad spectrum of society, not just parents, teachers, students, and others directly involved in the educa-

tional enterprise. To the extent that education can identify the nature of forces impinging on the consumers and the providers of its services, Asian/Pacific American education can continue to strive for equality of educational opportunity in America.

Asian/Pacific American History, Culture, and "Minority-Ness"

In a non-scientific survey of 124 students at the University of Washington, Morishima (1980) asked students to respond to the following question: "Think about the various groups of non-citizens living in the State of Washington. Please indicate in order of size the nationalities of these non-citizen groups. Do *not* worry about how many there may be in each group. Concern yourself only with the groups that you think are the largest."

The results of the survey indicated that the various Indochinese groups (Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian) were mentioned as the largest or second largest group of aliens by *all* of the respondents, while various Latino groups (Mexican, Cuban, Latin American) were mentioned by approximately one-half the respondents. The largest single group of aliens residing in the state of Washington was correctly identified by only four of the respondents! As in many of the northern tier states. Canadians comprise the largest group of aliens residing in the state of Washington.

In the same survey, respondents tended to characterize various Asian/Pacific American and Latino groups as being "immigrants" with few describing them as "American born." In contrast, blacks were characterized as "American born."

The tentative results of the study are consonant with the anecdotes which abound in the various Asian/Pacific American communities that while many Americans (both white and non-white) assume Asian/Pacific Americans are immigrants (with such characteristic comments to the grandchildren and great-children of immigrants as, "You speak very good English, when did you come to America?"), they tend to be surprised when they interact with a black immigrant.

Just who are these Asian/Pacific Americans? When did they come here? Do they have any educational needs and characteristics about which we as educators should be aware and concerned?

While many definitions of Asian/Pacific Americans exist, we have chosen to modify slightly a definition presented earlier (Morishima and Mizokawa, 1978). Asian/Pacific Americans consist of at least the following: (1) descendants of immigrants from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Southern and Eastern Asia (Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Tibet, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan,

and the like), and Oceania (Samoa, Guam, Polynesian Hawaii); (2) immigrants from those areas; and (3) children of "mixed" marriages where one of the parents was Asian/Pacific American. There is continuing dialogue on the inclusion of Asiatic Russia, and other areas, but the present definition clearly excludes the Middle East, Australia, and New Zealand.

The definition also excludes individuals from Asia or the Pacific Islands who reside in the United States with an intention of returning to their homelands, e.g., business persons, visitors, and diplomatic personnel, as well as those who are in the United States on student visas.

Obviously, there are many major diversities contained within the broad rubric of Asian/Pacific American. Religious preference ranges from Muslim to Buddhism to Hindu to Christianity to several other religious beliefs and practices. Languages range from a single language within a national grouping (e.g., Pilipino[1] immigrants may speak any one of several distinct languages such as Ilocano, Pilipino, and Visayan). Given the diversity of languages, norms, mores, and other factors, the term Asian/Pacific American implies a homogeneity which is lacking. Aggregation into one category is analogous to but much more complex than aggregating the Irish, the Poles, the Swedes, and the Italians into one group—European— and ignoring the vast language and cultural differences.

According to the 1970 Census (Urban Associates, Inc., 1974; Bureau of the Census, 1973; U.S. Department of Commerce, 1973), there were 591,000 Japanese Americans,[2] 435,000 Chinese Americans, and 343,000 Pilipino Americans. The 1970 Census also estimated 65,000-70,000 Koreans, 100,000 Hawaiians and 224,000 "other Asian." In other words, there were roughly 1.7 million people identified in the 1970 Census as being of Asian descent. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, 21,000 Asians immigrated and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, 124,000 Asians immigrated. This represents an increase of 590 percent. Since 400,000 people immigrated in fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, immigrants from Asia constituted one-third of the total immigrants. Between 1970 and 1973, 270,000 Asians and Pacific Islanders emigrated to the United States (Urban Associates, Inc., 1974). In the 1950's one of every 11 new Americans (9 percent) was an immigrant. By 1973, one of every five new Americans (20 percent) was an immigrant.

[1] Currently, two spellings exist—Filipino and Pilipino. Proponents of the latter are quick to indicate that the sound of "F" does not occur in the national language of the Philippines—Tagalog or Pilipino. We have chosen to utilize the more modern spelling.

[2] The convention of the eighties is not to hyphenate when the term refers to various Asian/Pacific American groups in the United States. The hyphenation refers to relations between the United States and various Asian/Pacific regions. Thus, "Japanese Americans" refers to individuals of Japanese genetic heritage living in the United States while the term "Japanese-American" refers to relationships between Japan, e.g., Tokyo, and the United States, e.g., the State of California.

The major increase in immigration resulted from the 1965 Immigration Act, which set an annual limit of 170,000 immigrant visas for aliens throughout the world and excluded immediate relatives of American citizens. No more than 20,000 visas are available to any single country. The visas are assigned on a preference system which gives priority to the reunion of families of U.S. citizens and to certain skills categories. In the fiscal years 1971-1973, there were 89,000 immigrants from the Philippines, 61,000 from China and Hong Kong, 56,000 from Korea, and 15,000 from Japan. In addition, approximately 300,000 immigrants and parolees entered the United States from the former French Indochina since 1975. Using the 1970 Census data as a base and ignoring births and deaths, this means an increase of 26 percent in the number of Pilipino Americans, 14 percent for Chinese Americans, 80-86 percent for Korean Americans, and 2 percent for Japanese Americans.

Asian/Pacific Americans, then, are experiencing rapid population changes. Working with data from the Bureau of the Census, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Social Security Administration, Owan (1975) predicted that the population of Asian Americans would double between 1970 and 1980. In 1980 alone, nearly 40,000 immigrants will come from the Philippines; 34,000 from Korea; 24,000 Chinese from Asia, and 5,000 from Japan. Thus, the 1980 Census will reflect a marked change in the composition of Asian/Pacific American groups, especially in view of the large numbers of immigrants and the proportion of the respective Asian/Pacific American groups they comprise. By 1980, Asian/Pacific Americans will number about 3.5 million with over 810,000 Pilipino Americans; 800,000 Chinese Americans; 760,000 Japanese Americans; 400,000 Korean Americans; 300,000 "Indo-Chinese" Americans; 300,000 Hawaiian Americans; 200,000 Samoan Americans; and 300,000 others of Asian ancestry. Since Owan's analysis, other groups have been added under the rubric of Asian/Pacific Americans—primarily, India and Bangladesh. The present immigrants tend to be somewhat different from those who immigrated previously. They tend to consist of women as well as men. Families are also accompanied by children. Present immigrants are more highly educated. We have a growing phenomenon which must be accommodated—large numbers of children for whom English (or more accurately, American) is not the primary tongue. *Lau* v. *Nichols* (1974) makes it clear that it is a societal responsibility to assist those children.

History

The modern history of Asian/Pacific Americans in the United States really begins about 1849. Their emigration (or lack thereof) to the United States may be divided into eight periods:

1. **1849-1882:** Heavy Chinese immigration consisting primarily of males, culminating in our first blanket immigration restriction policy—the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. The Exclusion Act was supported by "patriotic groups," both political parties, as well as labor and others. Agitation for Chinese exclusion stemmed primarily from the West coast, and San Francisco was the center. It was this era which saw the passage of numerous anti-Chinese laws: the cubic foot ordinance, foreign miners tax, and the like. One particularly interesting law was the laundryman's tax. If laundry was delivered in a vehicle pulled by one horse, the owner paid a tax of $2.00 per quarter, while two horses called for a tax of $4.00 per quarter. Since the Chinese usually had no horses, the tax was $8.00 per quarter if the laundry was hand-delivered. By 1876 both national political parties had anti-Chinese planks, and Denis Kearney had organized labor with his "Chinese must go!" slogan. The courts had also decreed that no Chinese could testify in a court of law in a case involving whites, and that Chinese were ineligible for naturalization.

2. **1890-1907:** Heavy Japanese immigration, primarily male, culminating in the Gentlemen's Agreement whereby Japan agreed to stop passport issuance to non-skilled Japanese males. The Gentlemen's Agreement resulted from a San Francisco school board decision to segregate students of Japanese ancestry. The Japanese government protested and President Theodore Roosevelt intervened. Rather than the expected hundreds, perhaps thousands, of students involved, the government located about eight dozen Japanese and Japanese American students. Ironically, the government could prevent the segregation of six dozen students because they were Japanese immigrant children, but could do nothing to protect the two dozen Americans of Japanese ancestry. In exchange for repealing the segregation plans in San Francisco, the Japanese and American governments arrived at the Gentlemen's Agreement.

3. **1907-1924:** Heavy Japanese female immigration and heavy Pilipino male immigration culminating in the Alien Exclusion Act whereby aliens ineligible for citizenship were excluded from immigrating. This period is also characterized by Alien Land Acts which barred aliens ineligible for citizenship from owning or leasing land. It is clear that the Alien Land Acts and the Alien Exclusion Act were aimed primarily at Asians. The Supreme Court of the United States had heard suits involving Asian immigrants who desired naturalization. In such cases, the Supreme Court ruled that the 1790 naturalization law made Asians ineligible for naturalization.

4. **1924-1934:** Heavy Pilipino male immigration. Pilipinos as American nationals were unaffected by the 1924 Exclusion Act. In return for a commitment of eventual independence, Pilipino immi-

gration was restricted to a quota of 50 per year. Numbers of Pilipinos continued immigrating by serving in the United States military primarily as menials such as cabin boys and cooks.

5. **1934-1943:** Virtually no immigration from Asia.

6. **1943-1952:** Chinese immigration opened to 100 per year. In 1943, Chinese were granted naturalization rights. The War Brides Act opened immigration to spouses of American military personnel. Immigration from the Pacific Islands, e.g., Guam and Samoa, began.

7. **1952-1965:** Token quotas of 100 per year given to each country in Asia. The quotas were usually mortgaged into the future and periodically "forgiven" by Congress. Relatives of citizens, war brides, etc., were allowed to immigrate as non-quota immigrants. Naturalization rights were granted to all immigrants in 1952.

8. **1965-present:** Virtual elimination of quotas and large numbers of Asian immigrants admitted.

Minority Status

Asian/Pacific Americans are a visible, racial minority group with their own distinct encounters in the United States. If we are to appropriately understand *race* relations in the United States, then research and interest should be placed upon the experiences of all four visible racial groups (American Indians/Native Alaskans, Asian/Pacific Americans, blacks, and Latinos). In many ways, Asian/Pacific Americans exhibit a greater degree of variability in socioeconomic and educational status than the other groups. Because of this, those in American society are likely to come into contact with Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans who are well-educated, high-achieving, and upwardly mobile. The notion, therefore, that Asian/Pacific Americans are somehow victims of racism is difficult for many individuals to understand, especially since our race relations model is largely a black-white one. That is, prejudice and discrimination against blacks is "real" since the presumed effects such as unemployment, poor housing, and poverty, can be demonstrated. But prejudice and discrimination are not as "real" for groups which contain larger proportions of individuals who have managed to move into the middle class.

Asian/Pacific Americans, then, are a very diverse group spanning many nationalities, philosophical and religious viewpoints, linguistic families, and racial groups—Caucasoids (Indian Americans), Malays (Pilipino Americans), Polynesians (Hawaiian Americans, Samoan Americans, Guamanian Americans, and Mongoloids (Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans, Korean Americans).

The label of Asian/Pacific American appears to be synonymous in the eyes of many non-Asian/Pacific Americans as representing either Chinese, Japanese, or Vietnamese American groups. The Chinese and Japanese Americans with their relatively long histories and their propensity for seeking upward social mobility through education have also been labeled as "model Americans" (e.g., Petersen, 1966). Yet, simultaneously, some teachers have confused the "Asian-ness" and "American-ness" of their Chinese and Japanese American students.

In this vein, one of our colleagues conveyed the following story to us. His daughter's fourth grade teacher had just returned from a human relations workshop where she had been exposed to the necessity of incorporating "ethnicity" into her instructional planning. Since she had a Japanese American student in her class, she asked the child to be prepared to demonstrate to the class how the child danced at home. When the child danced in typical American fashion on the following Monday, the teacher interrupted and said, "No! No! I asked you to show the class the kinds of dances you dance at home." When the child indicated that she had indeed done just that, the teacher said, "I wanted you to show the class how you people dance at the *Bon Odori*" (a Japanese Festival celebrated in some Japanese American communities at which people perform Japanese folk dances).

Obviously, the teacher was looking for a dance which would be different and which she could use to demonstrate that in a pluralistic society there are many forms of dance.

If we are to have pluralism, it is essential for us to understand the similarities as well as the differences between the many cultures which as a *Gestalt* constitute America. It is the emphasis on differences or upon the right to be different with the exclusion of similarities that makes mutual respect and acceptance harder to achieve. The emphasis on differences has led Morishima to state on several public occasions (primarily as a stimulus for discussion) that pluralism may be a gag perpetrated by sophisticated bigots on naive liberals and on the ethnic minorities. It is, after all, unfortunate for humankind to look with suspicion and, at times, hostility upon those we do not understand and those who are different. A truly pluralistic society is one in which differences *and* similarities are understood *and* accepted. A pluralistic society should also provide the opportunity for an individual to choose the subculture with which to identify and live. This means a broad definition of acceptance. Asian/Pacific Americans must be given the opportunity

to be traditional Asian/Pacific Americans, or a marginal man in Sue and Sue's (1971) sense. He/she must, in the case of the marginal man, be allowed entry into the dominant culture by the dominant culture *and* by the Asian/Pacific Americans. Pluralism does not negate assimilation for individuals or for cultures. Assimilation is, however, a choice, not a necessity.

For true understanding and acceptance to occur, it is essential that each of us knows the other as an individual and understands that we have basic cultural similarities as well as differences. Our schools and society now assume implicitly that only that which is white is American. Our society, and our schools which reflect most societal norms and mores, have tended to act on the basis of implicit assumptions which lead to cultural conflict. For example, a goal to foster independence in children may be accepted as a given by many teachers who may design strategies to attain that goal. For many traditional Asian/Pacific Americans, dependence, not independence, is fostered in the home. Similarly, the emphasis on individuality is dissonant with the view of traditional Asian/Pacific Americans that the family and group must take precedence over the individual.

The purpose of this survey is to provide information which supports the ideal of pluralism in a classroom setting. As such, it is necessary for us to provide a framework which involves the elements of culture and cultural relativism, minority group experience and history, and some examples of the dangers inherent in labeling—especially labeling as diverse a group as is encompassed by the term, "Asian/Pacific American."

Culture and Cultural Relativism

Culture. Kluckhohn and Murray (1956) have observed that every person is in certain respects like all other persons, like some but not like all other persons, and like no other person. One can choose to emphasize commonalities or individual differences among human beings. The emphasis in the school systems appears to be on differences rather than similarities as illustrated by the earlier anecdote on dancing. In discussing culture, we are referring to certain shared experiences among groups that result in typical ways of perceiving, interpreting, and behaving. It is not our intent to provide a more precise definition of culture. Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) have reviewed over 150 definitions and have concluded that:

> Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including

> their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values: culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action. (p. 180)

They further suggest that the definition may change: "The main respects in which, we suspect, the formula will be modified and enlarged in the future are as regards (1) the interrelations of cultural forms; and (2) variability and the individual" (p. 180). They acknowledge that culture can be considered as an outcome or as a cause of action. Our primary interest is in the latter—namely, how culture influences the perceptions, interpretations, and behaviors of persons in specific cultures. Thus implicit and explicit cultural differences in defining various educational goals, services, and curricula are important. Research strategies are also implicated in these issues since (1) it is through research that cultural differences can be determined, and (2) strategies themselves may be culturally biased and inappropriate across different cultures.

Kroeber and Kluckhohn's speculation over the elements that may change the definition of culture—interrelations of cultural forms and individual variability—are additionally relevant to our concerns. Given that cultures often differ, what is the best way to conceptualize these differences? How can individual differences within culture be appropriately represented? There are at least three possible relationships between two cultures in terms of a given characteristic. In the first possibility, cultures A and B have no overlap, with the former showing a lower degree of a given characteristic than the latter. The second possibility is that some overlap exists. The third possibility is that intra-cultural variability (the variability within A and the variability within B) may exceed the variability between cultures (between A and B). Obviously, the situation may be much more complicated especially if the distributions of cultures are not normal.

If, as is the case in our opinion, cultures substantially overlap in most characteristics, when do cultural differences *really* make a difference? Many investigators adopt the concept of a modal personality. That is, cultures may differ in the average scores on any particular attribute (Inkeles and Levinson, 1969). The greater the difference, the more meaningful the attribute in differentiating cultures. To say that Asian/Pacific Americans rely heavily upon the extended family for social support does not mean that Caucasian Americans lack this characteristic or resource. Instead, the statement implies that the groups have modal differences that are important to consider. In addition, the statement implies that while

overlaps in the distributions of the characteristic may occur, neither distribution is subsumed by the other. Similarly, it is not expected that all persons within a given culture possess characteristics associated with a modal personality description. It is our position that there are important cultural factors affecting Asian/Pacific Americans but that one must also explicitly recognize that similarites and differences exist both between and within groups.

Person-Environment Match. Another theme that has implications for conceptualizing Asian/Pacific American experiences is the importance of the person-environment fit. Rappaport (1977) has taken the position that there are neither inadequate persons nor inadequate environments; rather, the fit or match between persons and environments may be in relative accord or discord. The implications of this position are that (1) increasing the match or fit is important, (2) looking for weaknesses of people and communities is less important than creating alternatives that utilize and develop existing strengths and resources, and (3) differences among people and communities may be desirable. Traditionally, ethnic minority groups in general and Asian/Pacific Americans in particular have been caught between two models. The first is the assimilation model where minority groups' cultures are expected to adopt majority or mainstream values and behavior patterns. The assumption is that minority group cultures are less functional or transmit inadequate skills to its members and that minority group members may therefore not be able to succeed in the dominant society. Accordingly, it is felt that Asian/Pacific immigrants should be taught English because of its functional value. American styles of personality and social interaction should replace previous patterns learned in Asian/Pacific cultures. The second model is the pluralism model where it is believed that ethnic minority cultures have strengths which should be encouraged and maintained or adapted to the American or Western cultures and that to extinguish ethnic patterns would create identity conflicts and emotional and learning problems. Functional skills are necessary but they need not lead to assimilation.

Neither model accepts the importance of the person-environment fit given the fact that both people and environments change. It is obvious that environmental change is difficult. But we also believe that the significance of cultural factors has been largely ignored or inadequately exploited in educational settings.

Our belief is that in education the person-environment match should be of paramount concern. Mismatches may result in lowered academic achievement and intellective pursuits. It should be noted, however, that Kramer (in press) has voiced the concern that separatism may occur when different services are developed for various ethnic groups. If educational services are geared for local and ethnic considerations, Kramer's concerns would indicate

that those very activities would heighten segregation and divisiveness. The issues raised by Kramer are difficult to resolve. Nevertheless, education has historically provided inadequate services to ethnic and cultural groups. Furthermore, if the overriding principle is to provide person-environment matches in education, ethnicity is but one aspect of a more general philosophical orientation. The position we have taken on the person-environment fit also appears to be consonant with the rhetoric of teachers who claim they treat their students as individuals. The difficulty with the claim, however, is that too many teachers ignore the cultures of the students and because of their implicit assumptions attempt to force a person-environment fit without realizing that the interpretations of the environment may conflict.

Minority Group Experiences and History

Social scientists often limit their discussion of Asian/Pacific Americans in the United States to cultural factors. Asian/Pacific Americans are perceived to be culturally different from the mainstream culture. Consequently, Asian/Pacific Americans and the larger American society have evolved patterns of interactions, values, stereotypes, and practices. To argue the point further, it would be difficult to characterize black and white Americans as simply having cultural differences. Rather, patterns of racism, predjudice, and discrimination are intimately involved in black-white relationships and help to explain racial differences in perception, values, and behaviors. We feel Asian/Pacific American experiences are equally important to recognize. Cultural differences and minority group experiences must be jointly examined in order to fully understand Asian/Pacific Americans. For example, the reluctance of some Asian/Pacific American groups to take full advantage of educational opportunities while other Asian/Pacific American groups do may be the result of different cultural values or attitudes toward education. Another plausible explanation for this phenomenon is that some Asian/Pacific Americans, having experienced racial prejudice or discrimination in conjunction with certain cultural propensities, may avoid education because of distrust or suspicion. While we obviously do not present any comprehensive analysis of the historical experiences of Asian/Pacific Americans, we do refer to minority group experiences and feel that such experiences affect the educational setting.

The designation of Asian/Pacific Americans as a minority group that has experienced prejudice and discrimination is misunderstood by many persons. This misunderstanding is based largely on the failure to accurately assess the status of Asian/Pacific Americans and the conceptualization of racial discrimination. Popular notions of discrimination are grounded in the black-white race

relationship. Racism against blacks is apparent because of (1) the history of exploitation, and (2) the presumed consequences that can be seen in terms of social, economic, occupational, education, and health indicators. While historians and others familiar with Asian/Pacific Americans readily agree that Asian/Pacific Americans have had a history of exploitation and racism in the United States (Lyman, 1974), many persons find the second factor—namely, the presence of appropriate indicators—does not support the contemporary influence of racism. It is argued that, unlike blacks, Asian/Pacific Americans have high upward mobility in education and income. How can Asian/Pacific Americans be regarded as an oppressed minority group? This question, debated over the past ten years, is an important one with major educational implications. If Asian/Pacific Americans do encounter racism, then they experience significant stress and should be included in affirmative action programs. It would also be instructive to determine how various individuals have been able to adapt and adjust to these conditions. On the other hand, if discrimination and prejudice are historical rather than contemporary in nature, then the important questions are: What factors have caused the change for Asian/Pacific Americans, and why are there persistent claims from Asian/Pacific Americans that they are the victims of discrimination?

Our belief is that Asian/Pacific Americans still experience stereotyping, prejudices, and discrimination and that these experiences affect well-being. In many instances the incidents of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination are evident only after testing the incidents. For example, Morishima relates two personal incidents in classes dealing with ethnicity. One of the incidents may be sufficient to make our point.

Wishing to move closer to his place of employment, Morishima and his wife began looking for a residence close to the University of Washington. The neighborhood they chose happened to be all white and the realtors who handled the sales were primarily small firms not bound to the multiple-listing provisions of the larger firms. After scanning the newspapers, Morishima found a house and wished to have additional information. He called the realtor and reached an answering service. He left a message to call Jim Morishima. After two days, he called again, received an answering service, and again asked the realtor to call Jim Morishima. Three days later, he called again, received the answering service, and asked the realtor to call Dr. James Morishima. Two days later, he called again, received the answering service, and asked the realtor to call Professor James Morishima of the University of Washington. Finally, on the following Saturday, his suspicions being aroused, Morishima called, received the recorded message, and asked the realtor to call Professor James Morishima of the University of

Washington, leaving his university phone number. He then replaced the call and asked the answering service to have the realtor call James Forest ("Morishima" translates to "forest island") and left his residential phone number. Within two minutes Morishima's wife called him at the University informing him that the realtor had returned Jim Forest's call. It has now been ten years and Morishima has yet to receive a call from the realtor asking for Morishima.

It is our interpretation that while discrimination may not be definite, Morishima's surname provided the realtor with an ethnic clue and that there is strong circumstantial evidence for discrimination.

In one sense, the debate over the status of Asian/Pacific Americans has been a healthy one. It has challenged tradional assumptions about their success and has led to more sensitive research. One cannot but be impressed by the geometric increase in research on Asian/Pacific Americans within the past ten years. Four perspectives have emerged: The model minority image, the high risk orientation, the oppressed image, and the self-interest orientation.

Model Minority Image. This image of Asian/Pacific Americans has been the most persistent and popular. In this view, Asian/Pacific Americans are extremely upwardly mobile in the educational, economic, and occupational areas. The mobility is usually explained by noting such cultural traits as industriousness, discipline, thriftiness, willingness to sacrifice, and other cultural or family values that facilitate achievement. Not only are Asian/Pacific Americans well accepted in American society but they also have very "positive" stereotypes and are well regarded. There is no need to include them in affirmative action or special programs for minority groups because of their extraordinary achievements. Note, for example, that Asian/Pacific Americans were not specifically identified as a minority group (as other groups are) needing special consideration in the application form for Danforth Fellowships. The National Science Foundation's Minority Graduate Fellowship Program specifically excludes Asian/Pacific Americans because of their "overrepresentation" in the science and engineering professions. Studies should be conducted in order to discover why Asian/Pacific Americans have done so well if, indeed, they have.

One interesting study which recognized the deficiencies in the labels utilized in reports was contained in the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1975). In 1973, the Commission on Human Resources of the National Research Council compiled information on the ethnic characteristics of doctoral degrees conferred. The data indicated that of the 33,727 doctorates conferred, 2,429 (7 percent) were conferred on "Asians." A total of 3,971 doctorates were conferred on minorities with the Asians representing 61 percent of the total. In contrast, Asian/Pacific Americans re-

presented approximately one (1) percent of the population of the United States. At first blush these data confirm the model minority image of Asian/Pacific Americans. However, only 320 of the 2,429 (13 percent) Asians were American citizens. When American citizens alone were considered, Asian/Pacific Americans received 01.1 percent of the doctorates—a far cry from the over-achievement stereotype of Asian/Pacific Americans.

In the same vein, Connor (1975) reported that Japanese American males received lower college grades than did their white male peers while Japanese American females tended to do better than their white female peers. Connor concluded that there has been a diminution in Japanese American academic achievement.

The High Risk Orientation. The high-risk orientation implicitly acknowledges that some Asian/Pacific Americans have fared well in society. The concern is over certain groups that are particularly vulnerable to problems. These groups include immigrants, refugees, Chinatown youths, and the elderly, who are under increased stress. Various emerging Asian/Pacific American groups such as Pilipino Americans and Vietnamese Americans or Pacific Islander Americans such as the Samoan Americans are also considered high risk because their history in the United States is shorter and their social indicators of well-being are not as high as those for Chinese and Japanese Americans. The task is to select those groups that need special attention and resources and to provide educators with sufficient information to insure the inclusion of relevant cultural materials.

The Oppressed Image. In this view, Asian/Pacific Americans are seen as victims of racism. Statistics on their well-being are misleading and the major problems that they encounter in terms of prejudice and discrimination are ignored. Some groups (immigrants and elderly) are particularly powerless; nevertheless, Asian/Pacific Americans as a whole experience the same institutional conditions that blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans face. If racism affects education, then Asian/Pacific Americans suffer this additional stress and pay a price. If racism affects educational programs and services, then Asian/Pacific Americans are likely to receive unresponsive services. The oppressed image would suggest several courses of action: (1) Improved research strategies, free from biases and stereotypes, that assess the educational environment for Asian/Pacific Americans; (2) modifications in educational practices. The underlying process is to eliminate racism and to redistribute power in order to maximize the probability of positively changing the educational system and its practices.

The Self-Interest Orientation. The self-interest orientation is concerned with the status of Asian/Pacific Americans. It matters little if Asian/Pacific Americans are successful or unsuccessful.

Regardless of their current well-being, the goal is to constantly monitor, advocate, and implement policies that serve Asian/Pacific interests. The philosophy is not unlike those of labor unions, corporations, or other special interest groups. There is no need to document problems of Asian/Pacific Americans unless it is an effective way of drawing attention and resources to this group. If Asian/Pacific Americans are doing well, the goal is to maintain high status or to further enhance it. Political influence, lobbying, and exertion of power are the concrete means of trying to protect the interests of Asian/Pacific Americans, a minority group.

We have discussed these four perspectives because of their importance in policy implications, and defining group identity. They also provoke intense controversy and have been debated in much of the Asian/Pacific American literature (Morishima *et al.*, 1979; Sue, Sue, and Sue, 1975).

Social Issues In Asian/Pacific American Education

Education does not take place in a social vacuum (see, for example, Stephens, 1967). Parents have expectations regarding their children's education that responsible teachers and administrators do not ignore. The people in the community at large who support educational systems through taxes and contributions to both private and public schools expect schooling to reflect certain social norms and perspectives. Teachers as professionals bring their special expertise and orientations to bear on the shaping of curricula. School children, the primary consumers of education, participate by their every action in the formulation of schooling goals and practices. Legislators and school administrators at every level are actively involved in educational governance and policy formulation. Professional teacher training and certification program faculty at the college and university levels become involved in preservice and inservice teacher education by their participation in the setting and implementation of criteria for minimal standards in teacher training.

The education of Asian/Pacific American children does not differ in this sense from the education of any other child in any American school, public or private. Parents of Asian/Pacific American children are active—often vigorously so—in the education of their children. Grant proposals for federal monies to support many ethnic educational projects, such as bilingual education technical assistance centers, usually include provisions for direct parent involvement. Parents living in areas with large minority populations, especially on the West Coast and parts of the East Coast, are often members of advisory and special-interest groups to provide guidance to educators.

The Asian/Pacific American ethnic communities host organizations that become central to educational reform and change. The Pilipino Far West Task Force on Education in California, and local and regional chapters of the Japanese American Citizens League, for example, are continually called upon, both formally and informally, to provide advice on matters of curriculum and school policy affecting students from kindergarten through college age. When recent budget reductions in the Seattle School District prompted central administrators to initiate a program of reduction in force (RIF) and reduction in rank (RIR), the Asian/Pacific American community mobilized quickly to protest the original intentions for RIFing and RIRing based primarily on seniority. One reason for lobbying against such a criterion was that Seattle school administrators (that is, building principals and assistant principals) with the lowest seniority included Asian/Pacific American people who had entered the administrative ranks later than whites. Therefore, if initial plans were carried out, almost all the present Asian/Pacific American administrators would have been RIRed to the classroom, thus diminishing their effectiveness in the larger school and district scenes. At this writing, negotiations are still continuing, but the impact of this group of community leaders and members has been felt, and felt very strongly.

Teachers, too, share in the educational enterprise in ways that affect society at large. Besides participating in Asian/Pacific American education associations, teachers exert considerable influence on children's attitudes by the very selection of concepts, classroom instructional materials, and learning activities. (In another section, discussions of textbook representations of the Asian/Pacific American experience and contributions in America will be more thoroughly pursued.) Teachers, representing knowledge authorities, can have powerful roles as change agents in the classroom, where both Asian/Pacific American and other students can come into contact with social issues that may affect their personal lives intimately, now and in the future, when they assume adult citizenship roles.

And the context for such learning need not necessarily be social studies instruction. The study of literature and other language arts can be equally appropriate areas. Courses on American literature, for instance, have typically highlighted the works of well-known authors such as Steinbeck, Salinger, Wilder, and Hemingway. Educators aware of the relationship of any literary product to the *Zeitgeist* that prevails have included Asian/Pacific American writers such as Frank Chin, Lawson Inada, and N.V.M. Gonzalez to their curriculum.

Mathematics and the sciences are also appropriate. Major contributions to genetics, astronomy, and statistics have been made by

Asian/Pacific Americans. A glance through the pages of any volume of *Science*, the official journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reveals that Asian/Pacific American scientists have helped shape the modern scientific and technical society that is America today. Be aware, however, that not all Asian surnames denote Asian/Pacific American scientists. Some of them may be Asian/Pacific scientists.

Yet, one danger lurks in the attempts of educators to correct curricular oversights and inaccuracies: Tokenism. Many aspects of curricular change to more accurately represent the Asian/Pacific American in American life—whether sincere or self-serving—have, in the end, only served to maintain ethnic and cultural stereotyping and misrepresentation. Attempts to resist change for the sake of change, while stolidly pursuing greater accuracy in representations, often are difficult. (See Yu, 1977, for a description of one Asian/Pacific American educators' group's battles with well-known textbook publishers, for example.) While some may argue that "something is better than nothing," the reality is that it often tends to be worse than nothing.

Another aspect of Asian/Pacific American education in a social context may be seen in the children who are the consumers of educational services. Asian/Pacific American children do not often see themselves, their ethnic peers, or their forebears in the average American curriculum. The "Asian American Image Posters" of the Office of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction (1975) were an attempt to provide school children with ethnic models with whom they could identify. Large posters depicting prominent Asian/Pacific Americans with brief biographical data were printed in a limited edition of 100 sets which were quickly depleted due to high demand from educators in the state and elsewhere. The 41 Asian/Pacific Americans selected for the project included nine Pilipino Americans (e.g., Carlos Bulosan, author; Evelyn Mandac, operatic singer; Roman Gabriel, athlete), eight Korean Americans (e.g., Randall Kim, actor; George Pai, Attorney General for the State of Hawaii; Sammy Lee, Olympic diver), twelve Chinese Americans (e.g., March Fong Eu, Secretary of State of the State of California; I.M. Pei, architect; Bruce Lee, actor), and twelve Japanese Americans (e.g., Patsy Mink, U.S. Congresswoman; Harry H.L. Kitano, sociologist; Mako, actor).

The self-concept of Japanese Americans has been affected by the larger social environment. A study by Pang (1980, in preparation), which used the Piers-Harris scale for assessing self-concepts of children with nine additional items to supplement the items assessing physical self-concept, revealed that the Japanese American grade-school children in the sample had significantly lower body images than white children of the same ages. The Asian/Pacific American chil-

dren in school, therefore, facing the host of models and heroes who are non-Asian/Pacific American, cannot help but place themselves, at least physically, on the less-desirable end of the scale. Self-evaluations require, in part, some assessment of the feeling toward the self. Provision of more realistic and authentic models, then, may help the Asian/Pacific American child in finding his or her place in the larger world outside the classroom without fear or guilt.

The influence of models was described by Bergin (cited in Hankins, 1973). Among Bergin's summary of generalizations from studies of modeling and imitation were these: "Children tend to imitate more readily the behaviors displayed by models who have power in the environment to control and dispense rewards" (p. 114). With the relative dearth of influential, respected Asian/Pacific American models in typical classroom materials, Asian/Pacific American children must find their models among non-Asian/Pacific American people. But here's the rub: "Results generally show that persons who have some qualities in common with a model are more inclined to imitate additional new responses portrayed by the model than subjects who initially share no common characteristics" (Hankins, 1973, p. 114).

Interestingly, Pang's study (1980, in preparation) indicated that Japanese-American children attending a Japanese-American Methodist church had generally lower overall self-concepts than Japanese American children the same age attending a Buddhist temple. Whereas the models of power and influence in Christian scripture and tradition are white, models presented in American Buddhism are Asian and Asian American.

Administrators and boards of education share the social responsibility for education with teachers, parents, and students. Whereas one school district in Washington state has designated Martin Luther King Day as an official school holiday and endorses educational activities centering on Reverend King, an immediately neighboring school district does not. One Chicano family residing in the latter district chose not to send their children to school on that day but instead went, as a family, to attend functions in the adjacent district. School officials calling later to inquire about the "unexcused absences" of the children were not sympathetic to officially participating in the events scheduled in commemoration of Martin Luther King because, they said, there were not enough black students in their district to make such a holiday meaningful!

The case is just as bleak for some Asian/Pacific American parents and children. The so-called "winter recess" is coincidental with Christmas, and "spring vacation" usually begins or ends with Easter. Nothing coincides so neatly with Asian religious days such as Buddha's birthday, the occasion of Buddha's enlightenment, or the "Chinese New Year." The argument prevails that Christianity is the re-

ligion of choice for most Americans (including most Asian/Pacific Americans), and accommodations to very small special-interest groups can only go so far before a large-scale proliferation of official holidays for every religion or splinter group is manifest.

Perhaps. But the argument does not make education any more meaningful or important for the child who happens to be Buddhist. The Buddhist child (Asian/Pacific American or not) has to face some fundamental conflicts when reciting the pledge of allegiance to the flag, for in attesting to his or her loyalty to the American republic, the child is under peer pressure to also swear "under God." And in any case, recall the earlier reference to Pang's (1980, in preparation) study showing lower self-concepts for Japanese American Methodists compared to Japanese American Buddhists. Being Christian in America is not enough.

Further, "one nation, indivisible" has to be examined at one time or another in an Asian/Pacific American child's life when he or she discovers that 110,000 Americans who just happened to be genetically Japanese were, on presidential orde. moved from their homes into detention and internment camps—via horse stables in many cases—for reasons of national security. And the child could wonder why it was only in the 1940's that Chinese immigrants were allowed to become naturalized citizens despite their presence in America since the 1850's. And the child could wonder why other immigrants from Asia could become naturalized citizens only in 1952.

An additional problem in tending to the needs of Asian/Pacific American children is the general reluctance to support academic endeavors in higher education to train teachers in Asian/Pacific American issues and concerns, both curricular and psychosocial. In the fairly active period of the late sixties and early seventies, ethnic studies programs proliferated in postsecondary education (see, for example, Bengelsdorf, 1972). Yet, even with demands of accreditation commissions and state educational agencies to provide socioethnic experiences in programs leading to teacher certification, the attitudes of many faculties-at-large were grudgingly accepting. Indeed, the common compromise included courses not only in ethnic studies (typically, Black Studies, Native American Studies, Chicano Studies, and Asian/Pacific American Studies), but also Women's Studies, because of the similar experiences that women as an oppressed group share with ethnic minorites, and additionally included courses in alternative sexualities—homosexuality and lesbianism. This kind of compromise has been political, in order to acknowledge the logic and viability of additional socioethnic coursework on principle. Yet, the net result has been to allow students to fulfill the socioethnic requirements without a single course pertaining to American ethnics. The institution receives accreditation, state educational agencies are satisfied, and the education endeavor proceeds under the evasion of meeting the needs of every child. In many institutions, ethnic

minority faculty members were asked to construct lists of "acceptable" courses and to review any student petition for a waiver of the requirement. Refusal to endorse the substitution of a course in Far Eastern History for a course on Asian/Pacific Americans, has invariably led to conflicts based at least partially on a confusion between "Asian/Pacific-ness" and "Asian/Pacific *American*-ness."

At one institution of higher education, an Asian/Pacific American Studies minor has recently been challenged because "nobody teaches it in high school, so how can anybody even minor in the subject?" The same attempt to challenge the validity of certification in Asian/Pacific American education has included Women's Studies, and for the same reason. If one cannot teach it, one cannot specialize in it, goes the argument. Simultaneously, most would admit that the institutional goal of education is to teach the child, not the subject matter.

The fact that many ethnic studies programs in the United States have not received permanent status with full-time, tenured faculty members adds to the difficulty. One ethnic studies department in the West on annually renewable funding instead of committed monies has been severely challenged in recent years. A university official, testifying before the state legislature, suggested permanent status was not necessary for this particular program because there were so many ethnic minorities in the state that an ethnic studies program was unnecessary. In effect, then, the official might, on the same logical grounds, argue that the study of American history, politics, literature, sociology, psychology, or art would also be moot—there are so many of us around.

The presence of ethnic studies programs enhances the teacher certification process in that prospective and inservice teachers can acquire in-depth training without necessarily having faculty trained in this area within a School or College of Education. Nevertheless, the brunt of the responsibility for ensuring the availability of such coursework falls on the faculty in the certification programs. This responsibility, however, is not easily assumed in colleges that perceive Asian/Pacific Americans as successful, model minorities who require no undue attention. Asian/Pacific American education therefore by necessity requires attention to issues in higher education as well as in elementary and secondary schooling.

Administrators, school boards, and teacher trainers who grapple with these issues make a lasting impact on Asian/Pacific American education over and beyond their usual decisions on curriculum and schooling. Everyone, not just those involved in an official capacity, thus affects what happens in the education of, by, and for Asian/Pacific Americans. Responsibilities and blame are shared.

Generally, then, education has to appeal to and relate to the social concerns and status of the Asian/Pacific American. The purpose of adding Asian/Pacific American content to existing curricula and excising demeaning and inaccurate references is not token. Asian/Pacific Americans have provided significant contributions to the American experience. The issue is simply one of historical, social, and psychological accuracy.

But, again, attempts to rectify oversights and errors may be fraught with the danger of even further stereotyping and misapplication. For example, inappropriate generalizations from a small sample of Asian/Pacific American people depicted as models may occur. One goal of major curriculum advisory agencies representing the Asian/Pacific American communities, therefore, has been to provide realistic, useful materials portraying Asian/Pacific American people as individual human beings, not as typical (or stereotypical) exemplars of an entire group.

Immigrant Asian/Pacifics settling in America undergo experiences similar to American descendants of earlier Asian/Pacific migrants, to the extent that many people do not distinguish between these two groups. Indeed, as we pointed out earlier, there is an unfortunate tendency on the part of many individuals not to make the distinction. On the one hand, perceived language "difficulties" prevent full acceptance of the immigrant into the American educational milieu. A foreign accent often leads the speaker to be classified as under-qualified and in need of remediation. (There is ample demonstration of this tendency in the literature dealing with the Chicano child.) Naremore (1970), for example, found that elementary school teachers attribute lower IQ, lower social class, higher frequencies of behavioral difficulties, and even lower estimates of personal neatness to speakers of a nonstandard dialect of English in comparison with speakers of standard English. What is most interesting, however, is that the teachers only heard tape-recorded segments of the children's speech; teachers were not provided with any other personal information—no student records, no case histories, no test scores, not even photographs of the children. Yet, these ascriptions were made on the basis of a recording of a few minutes of each child's speech. In view of these findings, the implications of the Pygmalion Effect (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968), are filled with negative connotations.

The Asian/Pacific immigrant who does not speak English with native-speaker fluency, therefore, faces social situations in which he or she is at a disadvantage, like the black and white nonstandard speakers that Naremore tape-recorded. In a study of Chinese immigrant children in the boroughs of Manhattan and Queens in New York City, Sung (1979) found that the highest-ranked adjustment difficulty, by far, related to language. In addition, when asked

to indicate what they preferred most about living in America, the students marked educational opportunity as their first choice by three to one over any other. Given their strong motive for educational achievement, the language obstacle looms even greater.

The Asian/Pacific American student, both native-born and immigrant, does not just happen to be a "good ol' American" kid who looks a little different. The forces affecting Asian/Pacific American eduction are both immanent and imminent. Special materials are simply not enough, if the goal is to educate the whole child.

To reiterate: Education does not take place in a social vacuum. Teaching mathematics skills is a fruitless endeavor if mathematics cannot be used outside the classroom in a personally meaningful way. Parents, community members, local and state educational agencies, students, legislators, administrators, and college faculty understand that this principle, at least intuitively, applies to most of the standard content of any curriculum. The principle, however, also encompasses social values, issues, and concerns of the diverse peoples that constitute the body of America. Education as a collective endeavor proceeds inextricably and inexorably within the total American context. Thus, attention to this larger domain must be sharp, must be focused, and must be conscious.

What are some of the social constraints that Asian/Pacific American education must deal with? From one perspective, the set of attitudes, feelings, and biases with regard to Asian/Pacific Americans is not at all unenviable, in that Americans with these ancestries are often the objects of stereotyping that has been of late increasingly "positive." According to Sue and Kitano (1973), Chinese and Japanese Americans "are considered industrious, quiet, loyal to family ties, and courteous. In short, they are viewed as model minorities" (p. 91). The evidence they collected clearly demonstrated that, in contrast to prevailing attitudes over a decade ago, the movement has slowly been toward the "positive" end of the spectrum. But the attitudes are stereotypical, nonetheless. For example, at a recent regional conference on bilingual education and the teaching of English as a second language (ESL), a small group of white ESL teachers from the Pacific Northwest was heard to unanimously agree that they preferred to teach youngsters from Indochinese refugee groups rather than the Hispanic immigrants ("especially Mexicans," some said), because the former were always so attentive, clean, obedient, and hard-working. "Besides," one educator remarked, "they're more intelligent." (A stereotype of many Asian/Pacific Americans which may be interesting to compare with Darsie's 1926 study.)

But, in another sense, this particular set of social attitudes toward the Asian/Pacific American belies serious issues. Sue and

Kitano (1973), in reference to the Model Minority Syndrome, cautioned that such "positive" stereotypes may, nonetheless, also have negative effects. Expectancy theory can be invoked here as a basis for explanation, whether it is also called the Pygmalion Effect, or the self-fulfilling prophecy. Initial preconceptions teachers have about their students may lead to these teachers' selective attention and reinforcement of student behaviors which fulfill these preconceptions (stereotypes) nicely, and ultimately cause the teachers to ignore their students' real needs. Brophy and Good (1974) reported on studies indicating that teachers' expectations of student performance, based on perceptions of success (or failure) related to social class, physical attractiveness, gender, and ethnicity, among other variables, were directly related to students' actual achievement (or lack thereof). Therefore, one might logically ask, "If Asian/Pacific Americans are expected by teachers to be successful in school, how can the self-fulfilling prophecy hurt them?" There are, obviously, many responses to the question.

First, in many if not most cases, the stereotype is inaccurate. Characteristics of individual members in any group may not coincide with attributions about the whole group. For instance, if nurses as a professional group can be characterized as women, the rare male nurse is handily dealt with by calling him " the exception to the rule," and therefore atypical, despite the fact that gender is not a job requirement. Note also that nurses who are men are referred to as "male nurses," whereas nurses who are women are, simply, "nurses." The attribution to Asian/Pacific Americans of any stereotypical cultural characteristic is as clearly racist as "male nurse" is sexist, since the variety of personal differences distinguishing any two members of any group is multidimensional, descriptive, non-exclusive, and primarily not prescriptive. Thus, since all women do not become nurses—even if most nurses are women—neither are all courteous people Asian/Pacific Americans. (Later, we shall speculate on the interpretation of increased courtesy of an Asian/Pacific American child.) The problem of inaccurate stereotyping is complicated by the fact that even if Asian/Pacific Americans may be more of something than whites, that "something" may still occur quite infrequently across the broad spectrum of individual persons comprising the group (Sue and Kitano, 1973).

Attribution to the Indochinese students of higher intelligence by the group of teachers mentioned earlier may therefore relieve those educators of having to take any responsibility for their teaching (or lack of it). An educator might perceive an anxiety-stricken Vietnamese child struggling with schoolwork as atypical and might therefore easily give up the task of educating him or her. This failure leads to the next point.

"Positive" stereotyping may effectively exacerbate learning difficulties that a student may already be experiencing. For instance, an informal query of white graduate students at a university on the West Coast elicited this description of the "typical" Asian/Pacific American student in higher education: "If I walked into a class on the first day and saw a whole bunch of Orientals sitting there, I'd immediately withdraw from the class, because I'd *know* it was going to be a tough course." Upon discussion, it became evident that the group agreed for the most part, and that they had not considered the possibility that the "Orientals" might have registered for the class en masse as an attempt to find security in competition against the whites, whose academic superiority they feared. And for the "Oriental" students, the incongruity of having white students fear them—for no discernible reason except their race—may lead to increased feelings of academic anomie. Still, the white students believed that "Orientals" always got the best grades and were always the DAR's (damned-average-raisers) in any college course.

Another reason for not unhesitatingly accepting "positive" stereotyping as a benefit for Asian/Pacific American students has to do with the nature of the people comprising the group that is stereotyped. Just as "Native American" as a classification encompasses a wide diversity of discrete ethnic groups with different cultures and languages, so does the group label, "Asian/Pacific American." A statistic of "Caucasian, 78%" is almost as meaningless in this regard, since the category includes Irish, French, Welsh, Italians, Spanish, Portuguese, Czechs, Serbians, and many others. Any stereotypical attributes of Asian/Pacific Americans are thus insensitive to differences in the cultural heritages of Guamanian Americans (who might speak Chamorro and eat red rice), Pilipino Americans (who might speak Visayan and eat white rice), Hawaiian Americans (who might speak the Hawaiian English dialect and eat French fries), Chinese Americans (who might speak Mandarin, and who might eat long-grained white rice), Indian Americans (who might speak Hindi, and who might be strict vegetarians), Japanese Americans (who might speak French, no Japanese, and eat short-grained white rice with Southern fried chicken), and Korean Americans (who might speak Japanese, no Korean, and eat tacos). The point is that knowledge of stereotypes never makes dealing with any single representative of the stereotyped group any easier. The image portrayed by a stereotype, therefore, is undesirable, even if it is "positive" in nature.

Yet, stereotyping persists. One source of stereotypical notions that pervades education at all levels is the print medium—textbooks and other literature available for children to read and for teachers to use. In recognition of the role of inaccurate representation of Asian/Pacific Americans in children's literature, for example, the Council on Interracial Books for Children published a special double issue of

its *Bulletin* in 1976 (reprinted in 1977) on "Asian Americans in Children's Books." In an insert (p. 4), the following recommendation was made:

"Loaded" Words and Images To Avoid

> Over the years, the use of certain adjectives and images to describe Asian Americans (and Asians) has projected and reinforced offensive stereotypes. It is necessary to be particularly sensitive to "loaded" words, images and situations which suggest that many, most or all Asian Americans or Asians are:
> -smiling, calm, serene, quiet, shy, reserved, peaceful
> -short, stocky, small, buck-toothed, myopic, delicate, stunted
> -excessively obedient, passive, stolid, docile, unquestioning, overly accommodating
> -menial (the waiter-houseboy-cook syndrome), servile (as shown through repeated bows), subservient, submissive
> -artistic, mystical, inscrutable, philosophical, sagacious, quick, dextrous, expert in martial arts
> -exotic "foreigners" (even unto the second, third, or later generations), faceless hordes, or a "Yellow Peril"
> -sinister, sly, evil, cunning, crafty, cruel, or a people who place little value on human life.

Hata and Hata (1974) documented the numerous inaccuracies in the textbook portrayals of Asian/Pacific Americans which may be identified. In describing the Dominguez Hills project, which analyzed texts used in schools located around California State University, Dominguez Hills, they reported that in "some cases Asian Americans are still completely ignored; in others their role is distorted through blatantly negative stereotyping or through condescending caricatures" (p. 18).

Hata and Hata also referred to the development of the Model Minority Syndrome described by Sue and Kitano (1973) and others. The net outcome of the newer, more "positive" images of Japanese Americans, they said, "is often in the form of overkill, for now the Japanese Americans are hailed as members of a 'model minority' whose docile and accommodationist posture should be emulated by more militant and aggressive Blacks and Chicanos" (p. 18). Part of the syndrome includes a belief (inferred from many textbook treatments) that Japanese Americans have come out from under the dark cloud of internment in concentration camps during World War II, and have achieved success in mainstream America. They have "made it." But Hata and Hata cited figures from one study that found that:

> Japanese American males in California are 11 percent more likely to be college graduates then their white counterparts. Yet a white male's chances of earning more than $10,000 a year are 57 percent greater than those of a Japanese American (p. 18.)

Yee (1973) described the myopic view of Chinese Americans expressed in 300 social studies textbooks in elementary and secondary curriculum libraries in Wisconsin. Based on a content analysis of these books, Yee discovered that "Textbook references to China and the Chinese in past and present American life reveal an interesting pattern of neglect and stereotyping" (p. 107). Highlights of the findings included:

(1) About 75 percent of the 300 texts made no mention of Chinese at all.

(2) Of the remaining 76 (see Table 1), 53 (17 percent overall) gave token representation with a picture of an Asian, often in an interracial group of Americans, and/or one or two lines mentioning the existence of urban Chinatowns (e.g., "Chinatowns preserve interesting Oriental customs; San Francisco's is a must stop for visitors to the lovely city by the Golden Gate."), several lines about Chinese railroad workers, the laundry and culinary skills of Chinese people, their relation to China where their ancestors first developed silk.

Table 1. Types of Coverage and Content in Social Studies Textbooks Containing Information about the Chinese People

	Text and Illustration	Text Only	Illustration Only	Totals
More than two pages	2	0	0	2
one to two pages	11	5	5	21
less than one page	19	20	9	48
one sentence	0	5	0	5
totals	32	30	14	76

Source: Yee (1973), p. 108.

(3) Twenty-three textbooks (7.6 percent) devoted several paragraphs and some even gave several pages to the Chinese. Such coverage, however, cannot overcome superficiality and misrepresentation. ... Several books provided elaborate coverage that seemed prejudical and sensational in choice and orientation . . . (pp. 107-108)

But textbooks are not the only print sources that portray inaccurate stereotypes of Asian/Pacific Americans. Children's books

with at least one Asian/Pacific American protagonist were critically examined by a review panel established by the Council on Interracial Books for Children (1976, 1977—in the special double issue of the *Bulletin* mentioned earlier). Of the 66 books that met this criterion, 30 were on Chinese Americans, 27 on Japanese Americans, 2 on Korean Americans, 2 on Vietnamese Americans, and 5 were classified as "General" books (i.e., 3 of those depicted more than one Asian/Pacific American group, one was on a white boy raised in China, and the fifth was on a Japanese Canadian child in a Canadian internment camp):

> The major conclusion was that, with one or perhaps two exceptions, the 66 books are racist, sexist and elitist, and that the image of Asian Americans they represent is grossly misleading. A succinct definition of the image present would be: Asian Americans are foreigners who all look alike and choose to live together in quaint communities in the midst of large cities and cling to "outworn," alien customs. (p. 3)

Some of the additional liabilities attributed to the reviewed books were 1) misrepresentation of Asian/Pacific American cultures, with stress on the exotic and alien nature of superstitions, festival celebrations, and customs, 2) contribution to and perpetuation of the Model Minority stereotype, and 3) attribution of success to Asian/Pacific Americans based on white middle-class norms. Furthermore, only 11 of the 66 books reviewed were written by Asian/Pacific American authors.

Given Bergin's description of the role of models in learning (cited in Hankins, 1973), the implications of stereotypes in the materials used in education are major. Pang's (1980, in preparation) finding of lower physical self-concept, compared to whites, among one group of Asian/Pacific American children can be interpreted in this light. And disregarding the effect of expectancy theory (Brophy and Good, 1974) would allow teachers' preconceptions of Asian/Pacific American children to prevail to the ultimate disadvantage not only of the Asian/Pacific American child but of others as well.

What can be done? One approach might be to monitor decisions that schools and school boards make about curriculum content and materials. The kind of "textbook task force" described by Yee (1973) would be useful in many situations, especially where large-scale purchase of millions of dollars of textbooks could be made contingent upon authors' and publishers' productive attention to the overriding and underlying social issues involved in book use. Yee noted the low-level principles and conceptualizations in present social studies textbooks. He added, that "(instead) of arguing for reverse ethnocentrism and 'yellow history' materials and courses as a final objective, we would suggest that the generalizations and concepts aimed for in social studies should be universally applicable and illustrated by a variety of examples" (p. 110).

Hata and Hata (1974) recommended, among other courses of action, that "there must be appropriate treatment of Asian-American contribution to the struggles of people from many lands in the taming and development of the 'frontier,' " and that "(e)valuations of existing curriculum and textbook content should seek to rectify any areas of distortion or omission of the Asian-American experience, and make a clear distinction between Asian-Americans and Asians in Asia" (p. 20). And, finally, they recommended that the educational establishment identify and pursue areas of research on Asian/Pacific American groups in addition to the Chinese and Japanese Americans.

(It should be apparent by now that we have consistently used the term, "American," when we are discussing Americans of Asian/Pacific descent. Our usage of "American" as a descriptor is consonant with Morishima *et al.'s* statement that "while the use or absence of the hyphen may be important psychologically, it should be indicated that we believe the literature should be more explicit in the use of the qualifier 'American' in the future....(T)here are major differences between being Chinese and being Chinese American. To minimize confusion, the qualifier should be mandated" (p. x).)

One of the difficulties in responding to the needs of all Asian/Pacific Americans is that there is no single item of information that can be added to any curriculum that represents all Asian/Pacific American peoples. A reference to an astronaut-in-training from Hawaii is a reference to a Japanese or a Japanese American. A reference to the whaling industry out of New England and Alaska in the 1800's will include mention of Hawaiian American contributions to the trade. References to Asian/Pacific Americans in the United States Congress are references to Chinese and Japanese Americans. Asian/Pacific American languages include Chamorro, Cebuano, Okinawan, Vietnamese, Pilipino (Tagalog), Cantonese, Mandarin, Japanese, Samoan, Korean, Visayan, and numerous others, including English. (The wide variety of linguistic groups among Asian/Pacific Americans will be further documented and discussed in *Research Review*, Vol. 3, No. 4.)

An additional difficulty in identifying Asian/Pacific American educational issues is that, even if a single ethnic group is targeted for inclusion in an unbiased, accurate way, the regional, social, generational, and historical differences prevent clear views and perspectives that apply to every member of the target group. For instance, two studies of Japanese Americans (Masuda, Matsumoto, and Meredith, 1970; Masuda, Hasegawa, and Matsumoto, 1973) found clear differences in ethnic identity among three generations (Issei, Nisei, and Sansei—or first-, second-, and third-generation Japanese Americans), and between two geographical locations in the United States (Seattle and Honolulu). Not all Japanese Americans are alike.

Nonetheless, these difficulties notwithstanding, if the goal of education is to prepare an active citizenry in the world community attention to the psychosocial needs of every present and future contributor must be given. For the Asian/Pacific American child and educator, stylish pedagogy and slick, easy-to-use materials are not enough. Education does not take place in a social vacuum.

Works Cited

Bengelsdorf, W. *Ethnic Studies in Higher Education: State of the Art and Bibliography.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, August 1972.

Brophy, J.E., and Good, T.L. *Teacher-Student Relationships.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1970. Subject Reports: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Connor, J.W. "Changing Trends in Japanese-American Academic Achievement." *Journal of Ethnic Studies,* 1975, *2*(4), 95-98.

Council on Interracial Books for Children, Inc. " 'Loaded' Words and Images to Avoid." *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin,* 1976, *7*(2, 3), 4.

Darsie, M.L. "The Mental Capacity of American-born Japanese Children." *Comparative Psychology Monograph,* 1926, *3,* Ser. No. 15, 89.

Hankins, N.E. *Psychology for Contemporary Education.* Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1973.

Hata, D., and Hata, N. "I Wonder Where the Yellow Went?" *Integrateducation,* 1974, *12*(3), 17-21.

Inkeles, A., and Levinson, D.J. "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems." In *The Handbook of Social Psychology.* G. Lindzey and E. Aronson eds. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1969.

Kluckhohn, C., and Murray, H.A. *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture.* New York: Knopf, 1956.

Kramer, B.M. "Community Mental Health in a Dual Society." In *Community Mental Health in a Pluralistic Society*. S. Sue and T. Moore eds. New York: Human Sciences Press, forthcoming.

Kroeber, A., and Kluckhohn, C. "Culture." *Papers of the Peabody Museum, 47*(1), 1952.

Lau v. *Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563, 1974.

Lyman, S.M. *Chinese Americans*. New York: Random House, 1974.

Masuda, M., Hasegawa, R.S., and Matsumoto, G. "The Ethnic Identity Questionaire: A Comparison of Three Age Groups in Tachikawa, Japan, Honolulu, and Seattle." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1973, *4*(2), 229-245.

Masuda, M., Matsumoto, G.H., and Meredith, G.M. "Ethnic Identity in Three Generations of Japanese Americans." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1970, *81*, 199-207.

Morishima, J.K. *Ethnicity: Imposition or Voluntary*. In preparation.

Morishima, J.K. and Mizokawa, D. "Testing and Evaluating Asian American/Pacific Islander Bilingual Students." *BETAC Newsletter*, February, 1978, *1*(1), special four page insert.

Morishima, J.K., Sue, S., Teng, L.N., Zane, N.W.S., and Cram, J.R. *Handbook of Asian American/Pacific Islander Mental Health: Volume I*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, DHEW Publication No. (ADM) 79-754, 1979.

Naremore, R. "Teacher Differences in Attitudes Toward Children's Speech Characteristics." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1970.

Office of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. *Asian American Image Posters*. Olympia: Author, 1975.

Owan, T. "Asian-Americans: A Case of Benighted Neglect." Paper presented at the National Conference of Social Welfare, San Francisco: May 13, 1975.

Pang, V. "The Self Concept of Japanese American and White American Children in the Fourth Through Sixth Grades as Measured by a Modified Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale." Doctoral dissertation, in preparation. Seattle: University of Washington, 1980.

Petersen, W. "Success Story, Japanese-American Style." *The New York Times Magazine*, January 9, 1966, 20-21.

Rappaport, J. *Community Psychology: Values, Research, Action.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1977.

Rosenthal, R., and Jacobson, L. *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupils' Intellectual Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Stephens, J.M. *The Process of Schooling.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Sue, S., and Kitano, H.H.L. "Stereotypes as a measure of success." *The Journal of Social Issues,* 1973, 29(3), 83-98.

——, and Sue D.W. "Chinese-American Personality and Mental Health." *Amerasia Journal,* 1971, *1*(2), 36-49.

——, and Sue D.W., and Sue, D. "Asian Americans as a Minority Group." *American Psychologist,* 1975, *30*(9), 906-910.

Sung, B.L. *Transplanted Chinese Children.* (Report to the Administration for Children, Youth, and Family, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). New York: The City College of New York, 1979.

U.S. Department of Commerce. *We, the Asian Americans.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Urban Associates, Inc. *A Study of Selected Socio-economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census Volume II: Asian Americans.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, HEW Publication No. (OS) 75-121, 1974.

Yee, A.H. "Myopic Perceptions and Textbooks: Chinese Americans' Search for Identity." *Journal of Social Issues,* 1973, *29*(2), 99-113.

Yu, C.Y. "Pilipino Educators vs. Textbook Publishers in California." *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin,* 1977 *8*(2), 6-8.